



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,324	12/01/2000	Robert P. Enns	Juniper-10 (JNP-0044)	3838
26479	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
STRAUB & POKOTYLO 620 TINTON AVENUE BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724				DUONG, THOMAS
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2145		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,324	ENNS, ROBERT P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas Duong	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-4, 6-11, 13-20, and 22-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-4, 6-9, 11, 14-20, 23-24, and 29-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 10, 13, 22, 25-28, and 33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of *claims 10, 13, 22, 25-28, and 33* in Response to Election/Restriction filed on February 28, 2006 is acknowledged.

2. *Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 14-20, 23-24, and 29-32* are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **with** traverse in Response to Election/Restriction filed on February 28, 2006. Response to Applicant's traverse is presented below. In response to this office action, cancellation of nonelected claims is required from the applicant.

Response to Amendment

3. This office action is in response to the applicants Amendment filed on October 31, 2005. *Claims 10, 13, 22, 25-28, and 33* are presented for further consideration and examination due to Applicant's election with traverse, which is addressed below.

Claim Objections

4. *Claim 1* is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - “*the at least the part of the set of candidate configuration information*”. “*the*” appears to be “*a*” as referred to in the claim earlier. Please make the appropriate correction.

- “the at least the part of the selected set of configuration information”. “the” appears to be “a” as referred to in the claim earlier. Please make the appropriate correction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 13, 22, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Malik et al. (US006349306B1).

7. With regard to claims 13, 22, and 25-26, Malik discloses,

- *a storage device for storing at least one set of configuration information for the data forwarding device; (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*the configuration manager then enables a system administrator, via a user interface (see FIG.2), to use this information to manage the device.*

For example, the administrator may create new configurations” (Malik, col.3, lines 18-21) and that “*item 41 is the corresponding configuration for ‘new_config’, which includes a list of attributes on the left and corresponding values on the*

right" (Malik, col.3, lines 49-51). In addition, according to Malik, "*the resulting configuration created with the template contains the attributes from the template and the values collected from the model. The configuration may be stored in the configuration manager, in another storage device, or the Spectrum database*" (Malik, col.3, lines 41-45). Hence, Malik teaches of receiving the user configured '*new_config*' from the configuration manager or another storage device.

- *an input facility for*
 - *accepting at least a part of a selected one of the at least one set of configuration information for a data forwarding device; (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*
Malik discloses, "*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*" (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1). Hence, Malik teaches of retrieving configuration for a network device (e.g., routers, bridges, hubs, etc.).
 - *accepting at least a part of a set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device; and (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*
Malik discloses, "*the configuration manager then enables a system administrator, via a user interface (see FIG.2), to use this information to manage the device. For example, the administrator may create new configurations*" (Malik, col.3, lines 18-21) and that "*item 41 is the*

corresponding configuration for ‘new_config’, which includes a list of attributes on the left and corresponding values on the right” (Malik, col.3, lines 49-51). In addition, according to Malik, “the resulting configuration created with the template contains the attributes from the template and the values collected from the model. The configuration may be stored in the configuration manager, in another storage device, or the Spectrum database” (Malik, col.3, lines 41-45). Hence, Malik teaches of receiving the user configured ‘new_config’ from the configuration manager or another storage device.

- *a configuration comparison facility for determining differences, if any, between*
 - *the at least a part of the set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device, and (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model’s actual configuration” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

- *the at least a part of the selected one of the at least one set of configuration information for the data forwarding device, (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model's actual configuration*” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record*” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
9. Claims 10, 27-28, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. (US006349306B1).
10. With regard to claim 10, Malik discloses,

- accepting at least a part of a selected set of configuration information for a data forwarding device; (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

Malik discloses, “*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*” (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1). Hence, Malik teaches of retrieving configuration for a network device (e.g., routers, bridges, hubs, etc.).

- accepting at least a part of a set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device; and (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

Malik discloses, “*the configuration manager then enables a system administrator, via a user interface (see FIG.2), to use this information to manage the device.*

For example, the administrator may create new configurations” (Malik, col.3, lines 18-21) and that “*item 41 is the corresponding configuration for ‘new_config’, which includes a list of attributes on the left and corresponding values on the right*” (Malik, col.3, lines 49-51). In addition, according to Malik, “*the resulting configuration created with the template contains the attributes from the template and the values collected from the model. The configuration may be stored in the configuration manager, in another storage device, or the Spectrum database*”

(Malik, col.3, lines 41-45). Hence, Malik teaches of receiving the user configured ‘*new_config*’ from the configuration manager or another storage device.

- determining differences, if any, between

- *the at least a part of the set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device, and* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

Malik discloses, “*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model’s actual configuration*” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record*” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.
- *the at least a part of the selected set of configuration information for the data forwarding device,* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

Malik discloses, “*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model’s actual configuration*” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record*” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current

configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

- *wherein the act of accepting at least a part of a selected set of configuration information for a data forwarding device is performed by accessing a storage device of the data forwarding device, (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*” (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1). Hence, Malik teaches of retrieving configuration for a network device (e.g., routers, bridges, hubs, etc.).

- *wherein the act of accepting at least a part of a set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device is performed by accessing a storage device; and (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*the configuration manager then enables a system administrator, via a user interface (see FIG.2), to use this information to manage the device. For example, the administrator may create new configurations*” (Malik, col.3, lines 18-21) and that “*item 41 is the corresponding configuration for ‘new_config’, which includes a list of attributes on the left and corresponding values on the right*” (Malik, col.3, lines 49-51). In addition, according to Malik, “*the resulting configuration created with the template contains the attributes from the template and the values collected from the model. The configuration may be stored in the*

configuration manager, in another storage device, or the Spectrum database”

(Malik, col.3, lines 41-45). Hence, Malik teaches of receiving the user configured ‘new_config’ from the configuration manager or another storage device.

- *wherein the act of determining differences, if any, between*
 - *the at least the part of the set of candidate configuration information for the data forwarding device, and (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model’s actual configuration*” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record*” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.
 - *the at least the part of the selected set of configuration information for the data forwarding device, (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)*

Malik discloses, “*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model’s actual configuration*” (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, “*the*

method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record” (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

However, Malik does not explicitly disclose,

- *is performed by a component of the data forwarding device.*

Common knowledge in the networking art teaches,

- *is performed by a component of the data forwarding device.*

It is well known in the networking art that a computing device (i.e., a computer) can be designated as a routing device similar to a router with the use of multiple NIC cards. Hence, a regular computer with multiple NIC cards installed can act as a routing device in addition to performing the installed applications.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Malik with common knowledge in the networking art to present a computing device capable of comparing and determining the differences between the current running configuration performing the routing function of the computer and the potential replacement configuration, while performing routing functions at the same time. According to Malik, disadvantage of prior methods “*is that one cannot retrieve or store information regarding the configuration of a device*” (Malik, col.1, lines 32-35) and that “*one cannot configure different device types simultaneously*” (Malik, col1, lines 38-39). In addition, Malik discloses, “*the prior art methods are time-consuming, expensive, error prone, and limited in terms of the operations that can be performed*” (Malik, col.1, lines 57-59).

11. With regard to claims 27-28, Malik discloses,

- *wherein the selected set of configuration information for a data forwarding device is a most recently committed set of configuration information for the data forwarding device.* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)
Malik discloses, “*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*” (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1), which has to be the most recently committed configuration, or, in other words, the currently running configuration of the network device.
- *wherein the selected set of configuration information for a data forwarding device is selected by a user.* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

12. With regard to claim 33, Malik discloses,

- *wherein the candidate set of configuration information is an uncommitted candidate configuration, and* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)
Malik discloses, “*the resulting configuration created with the template contains the attributes from the template and the values collected from the model. The configuration may be stored in the configuration manager, in another storage device, or the Spectrum database*” (Malik, col.3, lines 41-45). Hence, Malik teaches of receiving the user configured ‘*new_config*’ from the configuration

manager or another storage device. This means that the newly created ‘new_config’ has not been loaded onto the network device.

- *wherein the selected set of configuration information is a configuration that has been saved on the data forwarding device as a committed configuration.* (Malik, col.1, line 15 – col.2, line 45; col.3, line 10 – col.4, line 15; col.5, line 11 – col.6, line 47; col.8, line 35 – col.9, line 31; fig.1)

Malik discloses, “*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*” (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1), which has to be the most recently committed configuration, or, in other words, the currently running configuration of the network device.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to traversing the restriction requirement have been considered but they are not persuasive.
14. With regard to the restriction requirement, the Applicants point out that:
 - *Even if the claims of Group I were a combination, MPEP 806.05(a) specifies that if a restriction is to be made, the claims of the combination must be assumed to be allowable, in the absence of a holding by the Examiner to the contrary.* Although the applicant contends that the claims of Group I are allowable for the reasons set forth in the amendment dated October 27, 2005, the Examiner has rejected these exact claims. Since the Examiner has held that the claims of the combination are not allowable, the restriction is improper. If, however, upon

reconsideration, the Examiner holds the claims of Group I to be allowable, the Examiner should state this in any further action.

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because MPEP 806.05(a) only defines a combination and nothing else. Hence, this statement is incorrect. Furthermore, "*specifies that if a restriction is to be made, the claims of the combination must be assumed to be allowable, in the absence of a holding by the Examiner to the contrary*" is quoted from "*Examples of Nucleotide Sequence Claims*" (803.04) and has nothing to do with the present application.

15. With regard to the restriction requirement, the Applicants point out that:

- *MPEP 803 provides that if the search and examination of the application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even if it may include claims to independent or distinct inventions. In this instance, the Examiner has already examined the subject matter of the pending claims and has addressed the pending claims in earlier office actions. The applicant assumes that these office actions were complete as required by MPEP 707 and 37 C.F.R. 5 1.104.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because MPEP 811, entitled "*Time for Making Requirement*", stated "*[s]uch requirement will normally be made before any action on the merits; however, it may be made at any time before final action.*" Hence, the Examiner can restrict the application at any time before the final action. In addition, Applicants' arguments filed October 31, 2005 suggest of such restriction because of the groupings in the arguments presented.

16. With regard to the restriction requirement, the Applicants point out that:

- *Further, the Restriction Requirement misclassified the claims into separate subclasses of claims 709. All of the claims pertain to comparing configurations of a device, such as a data forwarding device for example.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because group 1 is drawn to *computer-to-computer data routing: centralized controlling* (classified in class 709, subclass 244); group 2 is drawn to *computer-to-computer data routing* (classified in class 709, subclass 238); and group 3 is drawn to *network computer configuring* (classified in class 709, subclass 220).

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to *claims 10, 13, 22, 25, and 26* have been considered but they are not persuasive.

18. With regard to claim 10, the Applicants point out that:

- *Independent claim 10 is not rendered obvious by the Malik patent because the Malik patent neither teaches, nor suggests, comparing, with a data forwarding device, configurations for that particular data forwarding device.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because Malik discloses, "*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model's actual configuration*" (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, "*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model*

and the configuration record" (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

19. With regard to claims 13, 22, 25, and 26, the Applicants point out that:

- *Independent claims 13, 22, 25 and 26 are not anticipated by the Malik patent because the Malik patent does not teach comparing, with a data forwarding device, configurations for that particular data forwarding device. In at least some of these claims, one or both configurations are stored on the particular data forwarding device.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because Malik discloses, "*a method and apparatus for configuration management of a communications network, and which performs one or more of the following functions... enables retrieval of a configuration from a device*" (Malik, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 1). Hence, Malik teaches of retrieving configuration for a network device (e.g., routers, bridges, hubs, etc.).

20. With regard to claims 13, 22, 25, and 26, the Applicants point out that:

- *Independent claims 13, 22, 25 and 26 are not anticipated by the Malik patent because the Malik patent does not teach comparing, with a data forwarding device, configurations for that particular data forwarding device. In at least some of these claims, one or both configurations are stored on the particular data forwarding device.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because Malik discloses, "*a verification (step 87), [where] the configuration manager first captures the actual configuration of the model and compares each attribute/value pair in the configuration with the current model's actual configuration*" (Malik, col.9, lines 22-25). In addition, Malik claimed, "*the method of claim 1, further including the step of verifying the configuration of a device by comparing the model and the configuration record*" (Malik, col.11, lines 21-23). Hence, Malik teaches verifying (i.e., comparing) the current configuration information from the network device with the newly created configuration from the configuration manager or storage device.

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 571/272-3911. The

Art Unit: 2145

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason D. Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571/273-8300 for regular communications and 571/273-8300 for After Final communications.

Thomas Duong (AU2145)

May 26, 2006



Jason D. Cardone

Supervisory PE (AU2145)